

B3
determining an arrival time at an intermediate point within a vicinity of the destination location using the located travel information to ensure arrival at the destination location by the appointment time.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over DeLorme et al. (U.S. Patent 5,948,040) and O'Sullivan (U.S. Patent 5,214,689).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 20 and 39 to more clearly recite that the step/instruction for determining an arrival time determines an arrival time at an intermediate point in a vicinity of the destination location.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over DeLorme et al. and O'Sullivan.

The Examiner takes the position that DeLorme et al. disclose each of the instructions or steps of independent claims 1, 20, and 39 except for having a travel goal with an appointment time for arrival at a destination and determining an arrival time within a vicinity of the destination to ensure arrival at a destination location at an appointment time. According to the Examiner, O'Sullivan teaches these missing elements and it would have been obvious to combine these elements from O'Sullivan with the system of DeLorme et al.

DeLorme et al.'s system is like that described in the description of the related art of the present application. DeLorme et. al. disclose a travel reservation and planning system that allows a user to search for travel information using many

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005
202-408-4000

different types of criteria including a where, when, how, what and who. Using this type of criteria a user can query data records. The user may view found data and select, in an iterative fashion, a travel plan.

As noted by the Examiner DeLorme et al. do not disclose receiving a travel goal having a destination location and appointment time or determining an arrival time within a vicinity of the destination location to ensure arrival at the destination location by the appointment time as required by independent claims 1, 20, and 39. However, the Examiner incorrectly takes the position that O'Sullivan teaches these elements.

O'Sullivan discloses a telephone system that prompts the user for, among other information, a starting and destination travel station name and either a departure time or arrival time. The system searches the travel schedule for transportation from the starting travel station to the destination travel station that leaves around the departure time or is completed around the arrival time.

O'Sullivan does not disclose any system which receives a destination location and appointment time and determines an arrival time at an intermediate location, as required by amended claims 1, 20, and 39. O'Sullivan only discloses a process which receives a destination location and an arrival time. O'Sullivan does not disclose any system which utilizes both an arrival and an appointment time as required by claims 1, 20, and 39. Further, O'Sullivan does not disclose any system which includes determining an arrival time at an intermediate location in the vicinity of the destination location as required by claims 1, 20, and 39. The process described in O'Sullivan only finds an arrival time at a final destination travel station around a desired arrival time.

There is no disclosure or suggestion of any intermediate location or any system of determining an arrival time at an intermediate location.

Accordingly, even if the teachings of DeLorme et al. and O'Sullivan properly could be combined as suggested by the Examiner, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the claimed system, including receiving a destination location and appointment time or determining an arrival time at an intermediate location within a vicinity of the destination location to ensure arrival at the destination location by the appointment time, as required by amended claims 1, 20, and 39.

Accordingly, DeLorme et al. and O'Sullivan, taken alone or together, cannot render obvious the present invention as recited in claims 1, 20, and 39 and the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-19, 21-38, and 40-57 are also allowable, for at least the reasons given above with respect to independent claims 1, 20 and 39, and the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner takes the position that DeLorme et al. disclose each of the steps of claim 58 except for the claimed requirements of a travel goal with a destination location and appointment time and the recitation of ensuring arrival at the destination location by the appointment time. The Examiner takes the position that O'Sullivan teaches these steps and that it would have been obvious to combine O'Sullivan and DeLorme et al.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that DeLorme et al. do not disclose at least the steps of receiving a travel goal having a destination location and appointment time and recommending travel options and modes of transportation to ensure arrival a the

destination location at the appointment time. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, however, O'Sullivan also does not disclose or suggest any system having these steps. O'Sullivan describes receiving an arrival time and destination travel station from a user. Using this information O'Sullivan searches a database for transportation going from a departure station to the destination station that arrives around the arrival time. O'Sullivan is performing a simple search for one mode of transportation. O'Sullivan does not and cannot recommend a plurality of travel options or recommend a plurality of secondary modes of transportation based on a travel goal, as required by claim 58. DeLorme et al. disclose allowing a user to search and view information on more than one mode of transportation, but do not disclose or suggest any system which recommends a plurality of travel options and secondary modes of transportation to ensure arrival at the destination location by the appointment time, as required by claim 58. Accordingly, even if the teachings of O'Sullivan could properly be combined with DeLorme et al., there would be no disclosure or suggestion of the method of claim 58.

Similarly, DeLorme et al. and O'Sullivan do not render obvious the invention as recited in claim 59. DeLorme et al. and O'Sullivan do not disclose any travel goal subsystem for receiving a travel goal including a destination location and appointment time and a transportation subsystem having instructions to select modes and times of transportation based on the travel goal.

O'Sullivan describes receiving an arrival time and destination travel station from a user. Using this information, O'Sullivan searches a database for transportation going from a departure station to the destination station that arrives around the arrival

time. O'Sullivan is performing a simple search for one mode of transportation.

O'Sullivan does not select modes and times of transportation based on the travel goal, as required by claim 59. DeLorme et al. disclose allowing a user to search and view information on more than one mode of transportation, but do not provide instructions for selecting modes and times of transportation based on the travel goal, as required by claim 59.


Accordingly, DeLorme et al. and O'Sullivan do not render obvious the present invention as recited in independent claims 58 and 59 and the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: 
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220

Dated: May 19, 2000